

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VIII.

NEW YORK, JULY, 1853.

NO. 7

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,

At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, \$1; six copies, \$5; thirteen copies, \$10; always in advance.

PROBATIONARY STATE OF MEN.

We give the following excellent remarks from the Introduction of Dr. McCulloh's work, pp. 21—24. We commend them to the careful attention of our readers.

"Nothing is more distinctly inferable from the Scripture writings, than that Jehovah has placed mankind in the present life in a PROBATIONARY STATE, and consequently that fact constitutes the key to the intellectual comprehension of every particular pertaining to the providential appointments of Jehovah respecting mankind whilst they are fulfilling such a condition of being. This must be evident to the least reflection, for if Jehovah, who has created all things from nothing by his omnipotent power, has also placed mankind in a state of intellectual and moral probation, he must have necessarily constituted every other phenomenon implicated with mankind to be harmonious with the fact of their being in a state of trial and self-discipline.

"As to the theory of human probation, no one ought for a moment to fall into the gross absurdity of supposing that it is to operate in any manner upon the divine mind, as if informing him who among mankind would suit his ulterior object or purposes. The theory of human probation is simply this, that as Jehovah has made mankind intellectual and moral free agents, so he has required of them that they shall attain as such to a certain relative perfection through their own exertions and voluntary self-discipline. There is no mystery whatever in the matter; Jehovah instead of making mankind at once suitable for his ulterior purposes, as he could have done with a mere word, has seen fit to require of them as intellectual and moral free agents, that they shall attain to the required degree of perfection through their own exertions. To induce human action in this particular God has announced to mankind through the Scripture writings, that he will bestow eternal life and happiness upon those who will qualify themselves, and if they will not do so he has distinctly announced that he will reject and destroy them.

"Though the Christian world, generally speaking, have correct views as to the probationary condition of mankind in its practical or personal requirements from them as free agents, it is wonderful how few understand the phenomena necessarily implicated in such a condition of things.

"If mankind have been placed by their Creator in a probationary state, in which as intellectual and moral free agents they are to attain to a required amount of perfection through their own voluntary action, the following conditions of things are essential to such an object:

"*First.* The world we inhabit as the platform upon which our self-discipline is to be accomplished, must be of such a constitution as shall call into action those energies by or through which our self-discipline is to be effected. If our earth and all mundane phenomena had been made perfect, *i. e.* if every inconvenience was removed, and all things tended only to the exaltation of human happiness, how could there have been any probationary discipline in such a case?

"*Secondly.* If we are to attain to a relative perfection in righteousness, holiness, temperance, patience, &c. through our own action and voluntary self-discipline, mankind must necessarily be free to act, whether in doing what is wrong or in doing what is right, for it is only through the phenomena of such a condition of things that perfection can be attained as the act of our free agency. If men, therefore, are necessarily free to do either right or wrong, all the phenomena of *evil doing* must be evidently inseparable from the probationary condition of intellectual and moral free agents.

"Yet evident as the inference ought to be, this very imperfection which must necessarily characterize a probationary state, constitutes that wonderful perplexity concerning MORAL AND PHYSICAL EVIL that has puzzled mankind from the earliest times down to the present day. If any Christian will regard the subject but for a moment, he ought to perceive that the development of intellectual and moral creatures, who are to be influenced as free agents by a proposed reward or punishment, could not possibly be effected but by their being placed in an *imperfect, or evil state*, for the terms are mere synonyms.

"From the same consideration of mankind's probationary state it equally follows, that though Jehovah be absolutely omnipotent, omniscient, and infinitely perfect in every attribute of wisdom and goodness, yet he could not sensibly manifest those perfections in his superintendence of the affairs of this world without destroying human free agency. For since Jehovah has determined that mankind shall attain to their perfection through their own voluntary action, so any direct or sensible interference of God in his infinite power or attributes would destroy human free agency either in degree or totally, according to such interference. I do not mean to say that God never interferes by his providence in the affairs of individuals or nations; what I assert is, that when he does so, he accomplishes his purposes either secretly or through the instrumentality of secondary causes, and not by sensible interferences, unless on those occasions that are termed miraculous, and which in their extreme

rarity distinctly shews that Jehovah does not sensibly interfere in the regulation of human affairs.

"The clear discernment of this necessary peculiarity as to Jehovah's non-intervention towards mankind during their probationary condition, is of all other principles the most important to be understood in estimating the true character of the Scripture writings, for without we comprehend his peculiar attitude towards mankind as creatures in a probationary condition, we shall be plunged into inextricable perplexities in consequence of our belief in his absolute omnipotence and omniscience. A single statement may be sufficient to convince the reader of the correctness of what we have just remarked. Among the many enactments of the Law of Moses are a number of minute regulations under the immediate sanction of Jehovah, that were calculated to preserve the Jewish people from being infected by the leprosy. All these regulations in themselves are apparently inconsistent with the infinite power or goodness of Jehovah; for it is immediately suggested to our minds, why, as being omnipotent, did he not exempt the Jews from the disease, or else inform them how it might be readily cured. It must be evident, however, from such a query, that if Jehovah was to manifest his omnipotence according to this requirement, he ought also to remove every other inconvenience, however trivial it may be, that pertains to our present condition. In other words, we would get rid of the very phenomena essential to a state of probationary self-discipline, for if all the inconveniences of human life were removed, in what would our probation consist?"

"Again, in utter oversight of the circumstance that Jehovah, according to the Scriptures, requires mankind to attain to their perfection through their own voluntary action, the deists have objected, and many Christians have been perplexed to understand why mankind should be required to pray to God for things which he knows better than ourselves what is most suitable for us. The reason of the requirement is as plain as day light. Jehovah does not propose to make us to suit his ultimate purposes by the exercise of his omnipotence, he has left it to ourselves to become what we please, under the inducements of obtaining either an everlasting life, or of incurring an absolute rejection and condemnation.

"But though this great work is to be accomplished by ourselves, Jehovah has at the same time promised to help those who will *pray to him*, i. e. ask his assistance. Jehovah, therefore, will help men to attain to perfection, but he will not do their work for them; he assists them as far as they ask his assistance, and no further.* If God intended

* We have a distinct exposition of the manner of Jehovah's proceeding towards individuals afforded us in the history of Solomon. On his accession to the throne he had a remarkable dream, in which God appeared to him and told him to ask what he would. (*I Kings*, iii. 5, &c.) Solomon asked for wisdom and skill to govern his people, and which we are told (verse 10, &c.) was so pleasing to God that he promised him not only an intellectual discernment above all other men, but also riches and honor, that he had forborne to ask.

But notwithstanding this great gift of wisdom and understanding, Solomon's character will be found very low in the moral and religious scale. The theologians for the most part have been perplexed to ac-

to make men perfect by his omnipotence, he would not have placed them in a state of trial.

"The solution of all similar queries is to be found in the fact of our probationary condition. Jehovah in his wisdom and omnipotence has established a certain condition of mundane phenomena that are essential to, or harmonious with the probationary condition of mankind, and which are to continue permanently until his purposes shall be accomplished. We are therefore not to estimate his attributes or providence in the superintendence of earthly things by the standard of his absolute nature and infinite perfections, however much we believe in them abstractedly, but according to the peculiarities of the scheme through which he has determined mankind shall as free agents accomplish the development that he anticipates from their action as moral and intellectual creatures.*

count for this, as they suppose that Jehovah, in bestowing wisdom and skill upon Solomon, also *prevented him* by his grace, and therefore they are greatly puzzled to find that history essentially represents him as a worldly-minded, voluptuous man, who had little, and sometimes no regard towards Jehovah.

The simple truth of the matter is, that Solomon, notwithstanding the great intellectual discernment he received from Jehovah, was unaffected in his probationary condition by that circumstance, and was required to attain to moral perfection, like all other men, by personal self-discipline. Now there is no evidence from the Scriptures to infer that Solomon ever sought grace or assistance from God to enable him to attain to righteousness and personal holiness. Jehovah, therefore, never operated on his heart, because Solomon never asked such help, and consequently he continued a merely intellectually wise or philosophical king, who availed himself of whatever was in his power for gratification; presumably on the ground that he only did what pertained to his royal prerogative. Solomon's history, therefore, I apprehend, shews conclusively, that although Jehovah may bestow all other gifts or endowments upon individuals, yet he never bestows the grace that leads to perfection in righteousness and holiness, but to those who seek that assistance from him by personal application in earnest prayer.

* It was undoubtedly to this principle that Moses alludes, when he told the Jews, (*Deut.* vi. 16.) "thou shalt not tempt Jehovah thy God." In other words, that they must not anticipate any intervention of Jehovah whenever they might see fit to appeal to his omnipotence. They were to fulfil their duties under the appointments of existing phenomena, and must not expect that the circumstances under which they were placed should be dispensed with or modified, because Jehovah had the power to do so if he pleased. Our Saviour applies this text expressly to such a doctrine in his answer (*Math.* iv. 6, 7.) to the temptation proposed by Satan:

HUMAN MATERIALISM.

BY WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

The fact that human Personality in Scripture is associated with materialism, is one that ought not to be overlooked; moreover, it is one that an attentive reader of the Book may without difficulty confirm to his perfect satisfaction. No doubt this has been plainly manifested already, still, we think, an arrangement of a few passages, noting in them

by *italic* types the words with which personality is conveyed, may furnish additional confirmation to those who have been impressed from the foregoing chapters with the corporeal or organic basis of personality in the Word, and be, as it were, a key to the understanding of all similar texts.

I. *Personality is conjoined directly or indirectly with "dust."*

Gen. 2: 7, The Lord God formed *man* of the *dust of the ground*," &c. Compare with this, v. 22, "And the *rib*, which the Lord God had taken from *man* made he a woman," &c. 3: 19, "*Dust thou art*," &c. 18: 27, "Behold now, I (Abraham) have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, which am but *dust* and ashes." Job 10: 9, "Remember, I beseech thee, that thou hast made *me* as the clay; and wilt thou bring me into *dust* again"? 34: 15, "*Man* shall turn again unto *dust*." Psalms 103: 14, "He remembereth that *we* are *dust*," &c. 146: 4, "His breath (of life) goeth forth; he returneth to *his earth*," &c. Ecc. 3: 20, "All are of the *dust*," &c. 12: 7, "Then shall the *dust* return to the earth as it was; and the spirit (of life) shall return unto God who gave it."

II. *Personality is conjoined with "clay," and "blood."*

Job 33: 6, "*I* also am formed out of the *clay*." Isaiah 64: 8, "*We* are the *clay*," &c. Acts 17: 26, "Hath made of *one blood* all nations of *men*."

III. *Personality is conjoined, very frequently, with "flesh."*

Gen. 6: 3, "*Man . . . is flesh*." 6: 12, "All *flesh* had corrupted his way." 6: 13, "The end of all *flesh*." 9: 11, "Neither shall all *flesh* be cut off any more." Numbers 16: 22, "The God of the spirits of all *flesh*." Psalms 65: 2, "Unto thee shall all *flesh* come." 56: 4, "I will not fear what *flesh* can do unto me." 78: 39, "they were but" (or only) "*flesh*." 145: 21, "Let all *flesh* bless his holy name." Isaiah 40: 5, "All *flesh* shall see it together." Jeremiah 17: 5, "Cursed be the man that . . . maketh *flesh* his arm." 25: 31, "He will plead with all *flesh*." Matthew 24: 22, "There should no *flesh* be saved." Romans 3: 20, "by the deeds of law there shall no *flesh* be justified." 1 Cor. 1: 29, "that no *flesh* should glory in his presence." Galatians 2: 16, "by the works of the law shall no *flesh* be justified."

IV. *Personality is conjoined with "flesh and blood."*

Matthew 16: 17, "*flesh and blood* (man) hath not revealed it unto *thee*." 1 Cor. 15: 50, "*flesh and blood* (man unspiritualized, see v. 44,) cannot inherit the Kingdom of God." Gal. 1: 16, "I conferred not with *flesh and blood*;" (i. e. with no man). Eph. 6: 12, "we wrestle not against *flesh and blood*." Heb. 2: 14, "For as much then as the children are partakers of *flesh and blood* (were men) he also himself likewise took part of the same" (appeared as a man).

V. *Personality is conjoined with "body."*

Psalms 139: 15, "My *substance* (margin, '*body*'—i. e. *I*) was not hid from thee when *I* was made in secret" (in the womb). Matt. 5: 29, "not that thy whole *body* (i. e. *person*) should be cast into hell." 6: 22, "the light of the *body* (person) is the eye . . . thy whole *body* (person) shall be full of light." 6: 25, "nor yet for your *body* (person) what ye shall put on." Rom. 1: 24, "to dishonor their own *bodies* (themselves) between them-

selves." 8: 23, "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our *body*" (i. e. our redemption). 12: 1, "present your *bodies*;" (i. e. yourselves). 1 Cor. 9: 27, "I keep under my *body* (myself) . . . lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, *I myself* should be a cast-away." 15: 44, "It is sown a natural *body*;" i. e. the men spoken of lie down in the grave soulless—"it is raised a spiritual body;" i. e. the men spoken of rise spiritual beings.

The Apostle is not speaking of the resurrection of bodies in the popular acceptance, as distinguished from souls or spirits; he discourses concerning the resurrection of *men*, as may be seen from the preceding part of the chapter, for instance, verse 18, "then (if Christ be not raised) *they* also (the *men*, and not parts of them) which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished;" and verse 22, "as in Adam all die (all the *men* he is speaking of), even so in Christ shall all (the same *persons*) be made alive." Hence he goes on in the next verse thus, "but every *man* in his own order," &c.

Gal. 6: 17, "I bear in my *body* (i. e. person) the marks of (or for) the Lord Jesus." Eph. 5: 28, "So ought men to love their wives as their own *bodies*;" (i. e. as themselves). Phil. 1: 20, "Christ shall be magnified in my *body* (i. e. in me) whether by life or by death." 3: 21, "who shall change our vile *body* (or self) that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious *body*;" (or self). Heb. 10: 5, "a *body* (entire humanity) hast thou prepared me." 10: 10, "we are sanctified through the offering of the *body* of Jesus" (i. e. through the offering of Jesus). James 2: 26, "For as the *body* (the man) without the spirit (margin, "breath") is dead." 3: 6, "the tongue . . . defileth the whole *body*;" (or person.)

POPULAR ASSUMPTIONS WITH BRIEF REPLIES.

I. It is asserted that thought is not a property of matter. If this means a table, a stone and an apple cannot think, we find no fault with the statement; but if it means that animalized *living* matter, for instance brain, cannot evolve mental phenomena, we ask the proof. Has the Creator said so? Is it a self-evident proposition that Omnipotence cannot cause animalized and organized living matter to judge, reason, love, and hate? When it is demonstrated that this is impossible, and that it is impossible, nothing less than the testimony of God himself can be accepted as final proof, it will be time to pass on in quest of a *second* cause to explain the existing results, both, we may say, in relation to man and the lower animals. The philosophic rule of Sir Isaac Newton, in obeying which he made his grand physical discoveries, is most applicable here, "When *one* cause is sufficient to account for an effect, no more are to be admitted."

To all appearance, judging from the development of brain, and the corresponding mental functions or results,—from the facts of madness, either complete or partial,—from idiocy, and from the suspension of consciousness by pressure on the brain, and many other circumstances,—we say, judging from all these, there appears to be ground, broad and firm, for the conclusion to rise upon, that thought, passion, desire, and the like, as naturally proceed from matter when it assumes the form of brain, as perfume arises from ~~a~~ when it exists in the form of a rose, or galvanism when it coheres in

the form and subject to the arrangements of the battery. To all appearance this is the case, and, since it is the product of Heaven's power, it must be an infinitely wise ordination, and on our part it is the office of piety to acknowledge the device of his wonder-working hands.

In asserting that brain thinks, &c., in man and the lower tribes, we do not wish to be misunderstood, for, strictly speaking, it is not the brain of a man, but rather the living being man himself, that thinks and wills by his brain. A brain by itself, tant is, disjoined from the human system of which it is only a part, cannot act in this way, any more than feet can walk, or lungs breathe, or ears hear, or a stomach digest; but if we rightly consider we will discover, as already suggested, that the proper view of the matter is this, that it is the creature man who walks by his feet, breathes by his lungs, &c.; and the being man is a compound of these organs, with many more, capable of executing the various mechanical, physiological, mental or cerebral functions, peculiar to his order of animated existence.

2. We are told man's spirit thinks. We answer, it is quite an assumption that he has a spirit such as he is supposed to possess; it is another that a spirit must be a living substance, and that, if even alive, thought must be among its attributes. Who, with an authority that we may not wisely and virtuously question declares that man's spirit thinks, and wills, and desires? When will the distinction be drawn between a man and the spirit of a man?—between the life-giving breath and the Breather?

3. It is asserted that the man and his outward material parts are entirely different, as may be detected in the phraseology, *my hands, my feet, my head, my eyes, &c.*; the *my*, it is affirmed, is the "spirit" on its throne within owning these as its organs or members, and this spirit is alone worthy of being called the man. Well, if this reasoning is solid, what originates the *my*, or what is it that says *my*, in the expressions "my soul, my spirit?" If the "*my hands*," for instance, prove these members do not essentially belong to the human being, but are, as it were, accidentally conjoined with him in the meantime, then the *my soul* and *my spirit* prove the same as to the popular "soul" and "spirit;" and if a man is not a corporeal agent, nor a soul, nor a spirit, what is he? Every orthodox believer in the common doctrine about the human spirit, uses parallel phraseology to that on which such stress is fallaciously placed, when he speaks, as every one must do, of *his reason, his will, his imagination, his desire*. How very absurd to demand, is there a being different from this reason, will, imagination, and desire, who yet owns them all, and employs them to gain his ends? If the evidence is good in the first case, it is equally powerful in the second. A little reflection, we respectfully submit, would convince most persons of the language we have presented being just that of a human agent announcing property in his own members, parts, faculties, and in himself. If we say *my hands*, we also say *my-self*, and the being who underlies the *my* is the same being who underlies and originates the *self*. It is in fact a "*self*" claiming property in a "*self*"—a man declaring himself to belong to himself. The divine being is an absolute unity, yet he says "*my soul*," and is not the soul of God, just, the Eternal him-

self? When he uses the words "*my soul*" the phraseology is equal to *I*, as is detectable in the verse, "*my soul*," or *I*, "*shall have no pleasure in him*."

4. Men, it is again affirmed, will live for ever because they are spirits. Who has not heard the language, "a spirit cannot die?" Now we beg to answer, that the Bible no where declares man to be a spirit, and the same book never asserts that a spirit must live for ever. Angels are spirits, and who would suspend their duration on the order, or kind of being conferred on them, and not on the will, and power, and promise of the Supreme.

5. Men are in the image of God, and therefore they must be spirits. Where is this laid down in the Book, from which, of course, it is professedly derived? So far from God making man a spirit, when he produced him in his image, the Record instructs us, he was formed of the "dust of the ground." Gen. 2: 7, 3: 19. As all Bible students know, we are never expressly informed in what this image consisted, and to assume that it was in the point of "spirit," or, what is no less common in that of immortality, is to do what the whole volume palpably condemns. Man is of "dust," and was at the very first merely a candidate for an eternity of being, as may be easily discovered by an unprejudiced examination of the arrangements in Eden, and the trial to which our first parents were subjected there. The language "image of God," in which man as man is still found (James 3: 9, 1 Cor. 11: 7), seems to have a primary special reference to the dominion which was to be exercised by him over the inferior tribes, like that which the Everlasting maintains in the boundless universe, for so soon as it is said, "let us make man in our image," it is added "and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air," &c. Gen. 1: 26.

But whatever it may consist in, or however numerous may be its elements, it is demonstrable that it describes man not as a spirit, for he only *has* a spirit, being himself of the dust entirely; moreover it cannot lawfully be understood to intimate that he is immortal, since he has never been any thing else, in all the dispensations under which he has been placed, than a candidate for eternal life. One simple statement of what man is, and the position he occupies in the universe, is worth a thousand *inferences* drawn from the words "image of God," or a thousand conjectures as to what their meaning may be. Such direct intimations are abundant in the Volume, and they are to teach us in interpreting "image of God," what its import *cannot* be: patience and application may enable us to acquire a satisfactory apprehension of its signification.

6. Matter is base, and gross—man must be more than that. Man, we beg leave to answer, is just what his Maker composed him of, and that is, "the dust of the ground." "He knows our frame, he remembers we are dust." This mode of characterizing our divine Parent's material production, seems to be neither wise nor reverential. Our vanity may lead us to entertain foolish ideas about forms and substances, to establish vast differences between material beings and spiritual beings,—the latter more correctly to be described as matterless nonentities,—but we ought rather to act in a sensible manner, and consult for his glory in our con-

ceptions and language. Gross matter! where find we such expressions in the Bible? "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof." Men speak of matter as if it was execrated by the Supreme,—as if it was a Satanic production, thrust, against his consent, into the empty kingdom of immensity,—as if it was charged with all sinful and loathsome attributes and influences. Through some most contorted philosophising, notions like these have been common in oriental countries, especially in India, from time immemorial; and many a heart-sick child of man, is at this moment toiling there in penance, enduring terrific self-maceration, and located, in dreary contemplations, under some verdant shade, perhaps beneath the scorching sun itself, endeavoring to modify the material conditions in which they find themselves, and vainly hoping in virtue of their deeds and sufferings, to pass eventually into the tomb of unconsciousness, the infinite depths of Brama's nature, by whom it is the quintessence of all privileges to be totally and eternally absorbed, as a bottle of water, when broken, mixes with and is lost in the ocean whence it had originally been drawn. The Indian devotees and fanatics are the genuine haters of matter, because they have been taught it is the fountain of all uncleanness; and man—whom they most orthodoxically hold to be pure spirit—is regarded by them as defiled in consequence of his wretched marriage with it in the form of fleshly organization. From these wonderful climes the dogmas about souls and spirits, and the detestation of innocent tangible substance, have flowed over the western regions of the globe, both in ancient and modern periods. We trace the eastern conceit, concerning the sinfulness of matter, denying the "flesh of our Lord;" hence the anxiety of John to demonstrate that he "came by water and by blood"—that he was no shadowy being, as the Docetæ asserted, but an actual brother in the common organized humanity; we see it pervading the Romish Church, originating the institution of priestly celibacy, and leading deluded multitudes to ignoble self-torturings and deprivations; amongst ourselves we also find it, in a reduced form no doubt, yet really pervading the whole of society, for the mention of materialism excites horror in the most of minds. Let us cease to misrepresent and malign our Father's works; let us begin to acknowledge that, as far as man is concerned, the Scripture is the grand patron of materialism, for each member of our race is of "dust," and his "spirit," which has been so inordinately magnified, almost into divine qualities and proportions, is but a very humble, yet unspeakably useful, element—the ordinary electrified air of heaven.

We are what the Almighty has made us. To persist in cavilling at what lies at the foundation of our being is folly and impiety. Matter it is; but matter mysteriously, and often sublimely, endowed. The *Quarterly Review* lately asserted that "Chemically speaking a man is forty-five pounds of carbon and nitrogen diffused through five and a half pailsful of water;" common-place elements no doubt, yet how combined, vivified, enriched with diverse and inexplicable forces with which we are well acquainted;—forces of voluntary and spontaneous movements, forces of thought and will, passion and desire. Chemically, man may be so much carbon, nitrogen, and water; but so much carbon, nitrogen, and water, is not a man, and there

is the immense difference. The Venus de Medici, the statue that "enchants the world," is only a quantity of common white marble; yet it is marble touched and shaped by the chisel of genius, and he would be esteemed an imbecile who, while gazing on that creation, should exclaim, "is this the marvel of art, just so many pounds of ordinary marble?" The "Last Judgment" of Michael Angelo is, in one view, so much canvas, and so much paint, the value of which, in themselves, is very trifling; but then, O reader, observe, so much cloth, and so much color, would never form that awful painting; and he would pass in society as bordering on idiocy who would, when ushered into the presence of that great work, utter in derision, "what a noise to make about so many square feet of canvas, and so many ounces of oil and coloring substances?" It is not the materials, friend, one might whisper to him; it is what the mighty genius of Angelo, the Milton of painters, has accomplished with them; they are cheap and vulgar in themselves; they have been dignified beyond expression, however, by his magic pencil. Look out on a gorgeous sunset, and, as you contemplate the spectacle, think that it is merely so much vapor, penetrated by the rays of the declining orb; and what reduction from the magnificence and the pleasure does that lowly fact create in a sensitive mind? What cares he,—what, we may aver cares any one, about the elements at the foundation of the excelling vision? It is all, chemically speaking, easily understood and expressed; the effect, nevertheless, of the union, and position, and changes of the elements is divine indeed, and each eye, not utterly imbruted, kindles as it views the drapery, and the isles, and the halls, and the climes of beauty, delineated on the evening sky. There we see the Infinite Artist producing his visions of thrilling grandeur, and he may employ what elements he pleases. And now let us ascend to a higher field in creation, where we encounter the phenomena of life and mind. A man looks through a microscope, and sees the millions of animals sporting in a drop of water; he beholds in that singular world thought, and will, and desire, and love, and anger, on a reduced scale, and what though each creature itself is substantially nothing more than an atom of carbon, and an atom of water? True; it really may be no more; still it is this minute portion of matter endowed with such wonderful properties, that a resemblance is discoverable between the animalculi and the grandest mentalization in the universe. Orthodoxy sees in the case of these diminutive beings, no immaterial and perpetual spirit urging on the vile organization; at bottom these denizens of the drop of water are of vulgar elements, yet the elements are ennobled by life and undeniable mental functions. Again, consider the dog, the bee, the horse, and the beaver, for the same remarks are applicable to them. What though the creature in each case is of common materials,—carbon, nitrogen, and water,—look at its attributes, such wisdom, skill, discernment and kindness; and yet few imagine all this demands, as its explanation, the presence of a mysterious, immaterial, and deathless spirit. Matter in their case is wisely deemed, by enlightened physiologists, enough; and to a thinking individual it affords little concern what these beings are constructed from; yet with the various phenomena displayed by them, that his thoughts are attracted and his curiosity

stimulated. Only ignorance, to our view, as pitiful as it is profound, would, on considering the powers and excellences of these inferior tribes, give expression to the complaint or the derisive exclamation, "a few ounces, a few pounds of matter, and is that the whole!" No; it is not all, if he would more narrowly examine the point, for it is matter, by the wonderful energy of Omnipotence, gifted with astonishing capacities, evolving mental manifestations, in many instances of a high and interesting character. Once more, to make a last supposition, let us imagine an archangel subjected to chemical analysis, and that he is found to consist of but very common elements, similar to those detected in the composition of a human being. Shall we despise all he has ever said, and thought, and done, on that account? The lofty conceptions, the profound discoveries, the songs of transcendent excellence he may have composed and uttered, the emotions of love and piety that rose for ages, like a tide from the depths of his heart, shall we despise all these? Shall we underrate the worth of his being, especially the exalted dignity of his character, which stood forth, like a mountain clad in celestial beauties,—because the materials of his constitution are discovered to be cheap and abundant? The sunset is ravishing though but light and water: he is glorious in virtue of what had been evolved from a combination of material elements endowed with forces so overwhelmingly sublime. If matter could do the whole, what more could spirit, even with its fancied virtues and adaptations, be made to produce? we say made to produce, for even it would be a material, a something, in the hands of the Creator, who would require to furnish it with the capacities it was destined to evolve. These remarks proceed on the supposition that there is such a thing as "spirit," after the popular belief, and an attenuated affair it is; whereas the Scriptures most clearly understand by created spirit, nothing more at best than refined matter; the one element, or the material atoms, pervading immensity, moulded into the various objects, inanimate and living, appearing on its plains. Man is matter, we are of the dust, and that such unpromising elements, as they appear to our eye, can be so combined, and quickened, and strung, and endowed, as to generate all we feel, and see, and know, from consciousness and observation, betokens His might, and skill, and love, who is "wonderful in counsel and excellent in working."

(To be Continued.)

THE JUDGMENT.

BY THE EDITOR.

Much has been said and written on this subject; but we fear a large portion has been "words without knowledge," and that no really definite and practical ideas have been the result. The general notion of the judgment is that of a great assize or court, at which the entire race of Adam are to be assembled in one vast concourse, and that each individual case is *then* and *there* to be examined, and all the thoughts of his heart, actions of his life, words of his lips, as well as the *motives* which have governed him, are to pass in review, and his case be decided upon the evidence then appearing, after which the sentence is to be pronounced, and the execution to follow.

Against this view there are great and (with present light) insuperable objections. In presenting them, however, we are aware, we shall have to encounter an almost impassable barrier in the minds of many sincere souls who have had the common notion interwoven in all their religious thoughts and instructions.

Far be it from us to approach such time-honored sentiments with rude hands, and far from us be the wish to unsettle any mind in such a cherished idea, unless we can offer them a more scriptural one, and one that shall be more practical in its influence upon their hearts and lives. Believing, however, that it is possible the popular view may be erroneous, if not pernicious, in its influence, we shall proceed to state some objections to it, and then see if the Scriptures do not warrant and require a different view of the subject.

To the correctness of the view generally entertained, we suggest, first, an objection as to the *time* necessary to such a procedure. We are not to rush upon a conclusion blindly: and it is doubtless true that not one in a thousand, ministers or people, ever have exercised their thoughts on the *time* that must be occupied to *conclude* the judgment, if the popular theory be the true one.

The position we are to occupy on this subject, is not that of a *dogmatist*—or positiveness—but of *investigation*, to find, if possible, the truth on a subject of such absorbing interest to every serious and reflecting mind.

THE TIME necessary to an examination of each individual case, in the formal manner expressed or implied in the common theory, is an insuperable objection to it.

As to the number of the human family, it is impossible to arrive at any thing like certainty; yet we are not of those who suppose the number has been so great that they could not all stand upon the globe at one time, as some have affirmed. For a basis of calculation, we will suppose that one generation of the world lasts thirty years. This would give 200 generations in 6000 years. We will now take the present number of the inhabitants of the globe (eight or nine hundred millions) as the number to represent each generation; though it will be seen that this most likely gives us too many. Eight hundred millions multiplied by 200, (the number of generations from Adam to the end of 6000 years), will give us *one hundred and sixty thousand millions* (160,000,000,000!) as the sum total of the human family to be judged, provided the judgment is to occur at the close of the 6000 years. Now, let us allot some specific time to the examination and decision of each individual case, on the supposition they are to be judged in succession—that is, one after another.

1. Allow *one second* to each individual, and *six thousand years* must be taken up in the process.

2. Allow *one minute* to each case, and *three hundred and sixty thousand years* are necessary.

3. Give *one hour* to each, and *twenty-one millions six hundred thousand years* are required. (21,600,000 years!)

4. Let *one day* be the time for each case, and near *eight thousand millions of years* will be necessary to complete the judgment. (8,000,000,000 of years!)

We do not affirm such a period will not be occupied in the judgment, but it certainly looks doubt-

ful when the Scriptures seem every where to speak of the speedy *execution* of the sentence of the judgment on the *return* of Christ. There seems only one way to avoid this protraction of the judgment, and that is to suppose that the examination of all, or of large numbers, is proceeding at one and the same time. This indeed is possible, but then it breaks in upon the notion that each individual case is to be examined before all and exposed to all the race of men.

If we reduce the number to be examined and judged to one-half our estimate, as likely we may in truth, and then allow only *one hour* to each case, at least *ten millions of years* would be necessary to complete the judgment, and before sentence could be executed; or a period about *sixteen hundred times* as long as it has been since Adam was created.

Notwithstanding this seemingly insurmountable difficulty to the common theory, if the Scripture positively affirmed such to be the process of judgment, we would bow to its testimony; but we may find it does not, and we are therefore at liberty to search to see if some other view of the judgment is not the true one.

In addition to the foregoing objection, we urge another on the attention of those who believe the righteous will have a *priority, in time*, in the resurrection, whether that time be one hour, one day, one year, or a thousand years.

How is it to be known who are to have *part* in this favored class, if all in their graves have not been judged *before* the resurrection *begins*? Are the righteous to be raised, and then the process of judgment to be instituted, to see whether the Searcher of hearts has made a mistake? Or, are they to be tried, undergo an examination after their resurrection, as if *suspected* characters? Can we adopt either of these positions? If not, must it not be manifest that they had been judged *before* being raised? And why are they raised, and not the wicked at the same instant, except the wicked also have been judged, and found not worthy to have part in this prior, or "first resurrection"? If these things are so, then we are brought to the inevitable conclusion that the judgment, in which *character and doom* is decided, is at some period *prior* to the resurrection. This, let it be remembered, is not saying there is not a judgment—yea, "*a great day of judgment*,"—at, or immediately upon, the resurrection; but the *nature* of that judgment will be a subject of inquiry as we proceed.

Before going farther, we will endeavor to find out the meaning of the terms judge and judgment. They are variously applied in the Scriptures.

Judgment, in its most simple form, signifies the act of judging, or, the process of examining facts and arguments, to ascertain truth, propriety and justice. It also signifies the determination of the mind, or the conclusion the mind has arrived at from an examination of things presented to its consideration. It is sometimes put for the spirit of wisdom with which a person is endowed. Sometimes it signifies the statutes, or laws and testimony of God. This is often the case, as in *Psa. 119*. It is applied to remarkable calamities inflicted upon communities and nations. Also, to judicial decisions, and to the *execution* of the sentence following trial and conviction, or acquittal.

These are the general ideas contained in the terms judge and judgment. There are judicial judgments on individuals, communities and nations. The Lord told Abraham He would "*judge* that nation," who were to "afflict" his seed "four hundred years." The process of judgment is definitely recorded in Exodus. Not a personal appearance of Jehovah to the persons judged; but he tested them,—that is, the *rulers* of Egypt, by his servant Moses, and gave them sufficient evidence to have led them to regard his demand, to "let Israel go," if they had not persisted, through their covetousness, to hold those whom they had enslaved. The demands of Moses, and the evidence he exhibited, in the name of the God of the Hebrews, was the judgment process that was to decide the doom of Egypt, or her Princes. Then follows the *executive* judgment, or the judgment carried into execution; and the Lord said, as the *deciding* judgment was drawing to a close, "I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and smite all the first-born in the land of Egypt. . . . and against all the gods [princes] of Egypt I will *execute* judgment." The *executive* judgment commenced that night, and terminated, or was *completed*, at the Red Sea, when Pharaoh and all his princes were destroyed. This was judging a nation, or rather her *body of rulers*. The principle, we apprehend, is here brought out, that the judgment is constituted or made up of two parts, viz.: the *investigating* judgment, and the *executive* judgment. The one precedes the other. The first goes on while in a *state of trial*, and when the trial closes, and the evidence or testimony is all elicited, the sentence is passed; the executive judgment follows after at some fixed period. We might illustrate this view with several other examples from Scripture, but we judge this is sufficient for the present.

(To be continued.)

The Christian belief in the second century, concerning the state of the dead, is thus set forth by Dr. Gieseler:—"Till then (viz., the "first resurrection") the souls of the departed were to be kept in the under-world (*hades*), and the opinion that they should be taken up into heaven, immediately after death, was considered a Gnostic heresy."—*Eccles. Hist.*, vol. I, p. 167.

A BEAUTIFUL SENTIMENT.—The late eminent Judge, Sir Allan Parke, once said at a public meeting in London:

"We live in the midst of blessings, till we are utterly insensible of their greatness, and of the source from whence they flow. We speak of our civilization, our freedom, our laws, and forget, entirely, how large a share is due to Christianity. Blot Christianity out of man's history, and what would his laws have been? what his civilization? Christianity is mixed up with our very being, and our very life; there is not a familiar object around us which does not wear a different aspect, because the light of Christian love is upon it—not a law which does not owe its truth and gentleness to Christianity—not a custom which cannot be traced in all its holy, beautiful parts, to the gospel."

"THE CROSS OF CHRIST."—The second number by Br. Ham on this interesting subject we have been obliged to lay over till next month.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JULY, 1853.

"BIBLE CONVENTION."—Such was the name of a Convention called at Hartford, Conn., June 2d, by Andrew Jackson Davis—the great clairvoyant, and leader in spirit manifestations—and others. The call was of some weeks standing in the New York Tribune, and also in other papers. It professed the determination to examine the authenticity of the Bible, &c., and to give the believers in it a full share of time to defend it, if they could. It was manifest that the call was gotten up with the deepest hostility to the Bible; and we cannot help the suspicion that the design was to overthrow its divine authority, and then to establish "spirit rappings," or "spirit manifestations" on its ruins.

We had no idea of attending that Convention, but through the earnest solicitation of Br. Miles Grant, of Winsted, Conn., we at last consented to go, two days before the time appointed for the meeting. We did not arrive till after the morning session of the first day. Most of the first day was occupied by the opposers of the Bible; though Br. Joseph Turner, of Hartford, and myself occupied a part of the time. Near the close of the first day a resolution was adopted giving the stand alternately, for forty minutes, to the speakers on the different sides of the question. This seemed fair, but as the sequel will show was not adhered to by the Anti-Bible party. Still we were not disposed to complain, only we wished the fact to be known.

A long string of charges was brought against the Bible, by the Chairman, Joseph Barker, of Ohio, recently from England, and formerly a Methodist preacher—in which he attempted to make out that the Bible sanctioned all manner of crimes, &c. He was followed by Henry C. Wright, formerly a Congregational minister; once a Non-Resistant and Peace man, but now an opposer of the Bible. He opened with the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Bible, in some parts of the Old and New Testaments, sanctions injustice, concubinage, prostitution, oppression, war, plunder, and wholesale murder; and, therefore, the doctrine of the Bible, *as a whole*, is false, and injurious to the social and spiritual growth and perfection of man."

This resolution opened the battle in earnest. We took the stand and remarked, that when any person was accused of crime the *law* by which he was to be tried should be distinctly stated and known; else how is it to be known whether he is guilty or not. We demanded, therefore, *the law* by which the Bible was to be tried. This inquiry was approved by Mr. Wright, and he undertook to define the law, which seemed to be very indefinite, as it

was the sense of right every man had in himself. As the definition was unsatisfactory, he was pressed for something more definite. After much time had been spent in this inquiry, we asked Mr. Wright, if we were to understand him that the law under which the Bible was to be tried, on his charges, was "Natural Religion, the Theology of Nature, or the God of Nature?" To this he answered distinctly—"Yes." We thanked him that he had at last given a *definite* law, and here we joined issue with him, and those on his side of the question. We showed that, tried by this law he could not *condemn* the Bible, even if it sanctioned all he had charged upon it: for the God of Nature swept away, by "wholesale murder," whole cities by earthquakes, laying them desolate in a moment: by floods he overwhelmed various parts of the land, "*robbing*" the laborers of their hard toil: by pestilence, cholera, &c., he inflicts the most terrible sufferings and distress: that the God of Nature, for aught can be made to appear without the Bible, "sanctions injustice, concubinage, and prostitution," inasmuch as these practices prevail where the influence of the Bible is not known. We affirmed, therefore, that the Bible, or the God of the Bible, tried by the law as defined by the opposers of it must be *acquitted*. Mr. Wright made a faint effort to clear his God of Nature from the charge of "wholesale murder;" and said, he "denied that the God of Nature ever did send an earthquake to kill anybody—earthquakes were natural omens; and if men had not got in the way of it they would not have been killed," &c.

We replied to him, that his "natural omens" were the natural *actions* of his God of Nature! and when this God of Nature knew that his "natural omen" would pass along that way he gave the innocent inhabitants of the city, who had never sinned against him, no notice of his intention, but came upon them suddenly and overwhelmed them in ruin. Whereas, the God of the Bible, when about to destroy the wicked inhabitants of Canaan, who had planted themselves on a land which the Most High had given to the children of Israel when he divided the earth among the inhabitants, gave them "*forty years*" notice of his determination to put Israel into the land he had given them; and confirmed the truth of his purpose in the matter by the astonishing works he performed for Israel in Egypt and in the wilderness: so that the God of the Bible was *better* than his God of Nature, and could not be condemned by the law specified.

Mr. Wright said, "the God of the Bible commanded Abraham to *butcher* his son;" and added—"I have been asked if I would do such a deed if

God commanded it? No! I would *cut the throat of such a God.*" Mr. Wright uttered this with terrible emphasis.

We replied, that when our friend Wright was a follower of Jesus he was a *peace* man, but now he seems changed into a *war* man: that then he was a *non-resistance* man—would not use violence if a man was to injure his family in any way; but now he is for blood: yes, if only *commanded*—not compelled—to kill his child he would "*cut the throat of such a God!*" We denied that God commanded Abraham to "*butcher his son;*" and when Abraham put forth his hand to take the knife God commanded him not to do it. We affirmed that Mr. Wright's God of Nature had not only commanded, but *compelled* tender mothers to *kill* and *eat* their children, as in cases of siege and famine in cities. We called upon friend Wright to cut the throat of his God, for he was a far worse God than the God of the Bible, even if the former were as bad as he had charged. Besides, his God of Nature gives no revelation of reasons for his murderous conduct; while the God of the Bible does inform us of another life and the reasons of the evils of this.

Mr. Wright maintained that the God of Nature took men to a better state or condition when they die. He had however only one proof to offer on this point, *viz*: "The caterpillar turns to a butterfly:" *ergo*, a man at death is transformed in like manner.

This wonderful illustration we have heard urged so many times, in seeming triumph, that we thought best to show its fallacy, and remarked that in the case of the caterpillar *life* never was *extinct*: penetrate his habitation and extinguish life and see if a butterfly ever appears: *never*. And the butterfly—where is its transformation at death? there it lies upon the earth, and returns to dust. This marvellous illustration of what the God of Nature does with man at death is evaporated, and proves nothing of his hereafter. No, the God of Nature gives not one ray of light on that period beyond this life.

Mr. Wright had spoken in the most unmerciful manner of the Levitical priesthood and its institutions, calling them "*a contemptible foolery;*" and then proceeded to make some criticisms on the teaching of Jesus. To show how faulty Jesus was, he quoted Mat. 5: 27, 28—"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." That is, said Mr. Wright, "If a man *desires* a woman for a wife he has committed adultery according to Jesus!"

We must say we were shocked at such a glaring perversion of words; and at such an attempt to pour contempt on Jesus the Life Giver. In reply we first read an extract from Lord Bolingbroke, which Dr. McCulloh has quoted in his "Proofs of Credibility of Scripture Writers," vol. 1, page 240. Dr. McCulloh says:—

"Lord Bolingbroke, however inimical to the theory of the divine constitution of Christianity, has not hesitated to render the clearest testimony to its excellent morality, as the following extracts from his writings abundantly show. And his observation on the subject of theological teaching, not only is creditable to his discernment, but does justice to the actual merits of Christianity, which most other deists have endeavored to confound with false teachings of men."

The following are the extracts Dr. McCulloh gives from Bolingbroke, and which we read in our reply to Mr. Wright.

"The gospel teaches universal benevolence, recommends the precepts of it, and commands the observation of them in particular instances occasionally, always supposes them, always enforces them, and makes the law of right reason a law in every possible definition of the word beyond all cavil. *I say beyond all cavil*, because a great deal of *silly cavil* has been employed to perplex the plainest thing in nature, and the best determined signification of words according to the different occasions on which they are used."—*Bolingbroke, Essay 4, section 5.*

"The gospel of Christ is one continued lesson of the strictest morality, of justice, of benevolence, and of universal charity."—*Bolingbroke, Fragments of Essays, 20.*

We then proceeded to remark, that Mr. Wright had called the "Jewish Priesthood a contemptible foolery," but we would not call his criticism on our Lord's words a "*contemptible*" criticism, yet we would in the language of Lord Bolingbroke, call it a "*silly cavil.*" It was an unwarrantable construction of the words; an attempt to make it appear that Jesus was opposed to honorable marriage. We called attention to Math. 19: 4—6, "The Pharisees" asked him, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And Jesus answering, said unto them, Have ye not read that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said for this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore, they are no more ~~one~~ twain but one flesh. What therefore *God hath joined together let not man put asunder.*" How does my friend Wright's *cavil* look in the light of this announcement? Truly it is a "*silly cavil.*"

Other speakers against the Bible were answered by Br. Turner; and answered well. We must say

that he did nobly for the truth. If the speeches are reported and published, as the leaders in the Convention said they should be, we shall publish more fully on the subject at another time.

After the second day there was a strong desire manifested to prevent "two men"—as they called Br. Turner and ourself—occupying *half* the time of the Convention, and a move was made to alter the rule, which however failed, the more intelligent of their own party opposing it. Nevertheless in several instances injustice was done us by putting down as on our side of the question some spirit rappers, and even one insane man, because they professed to believe some things in the Bible inspired, while they manifestly had no confidence in it now. By this means the leaders managed to occupy just about two-thirds of the time. At this point we take pleasure in saying, that Andrew Jackson Davis did not approve of that course; and however mistaken we regard him in his theory, he acted a gentlemanly part throughout; and it is gratifying to our feelings to give him this credit.

The spirit rapping manifestations were not reached before the Convention closed, at the end of the fourth day. So much of the design of that meeting was defeated, if we are right in our view of its design.

Mr. Barker would be best replied to by republishing in this country his work, published in England 1841, entitled "*Christianity Triumphant*;" a masterly work, which we deeply regretted we did not have with us at the Convention. Had we anticipated meeting him there, we would have had it with us. We will at a future time furnish our readers with some extracts from it, by which they will see that Joseph Barker the *Christian* is more than a match for Joseph Barker the *Deist*.

Mr. Barker said, in the Convention, that our remarks on the God of Nature would lead to Atheism. We were well aware that we crowded him and his fellow-laborers up to Atheism; that is the ultimate and legitimate end of their position—they must go there or return to the God of the Bible, there is no avoiding it. No man can prove whether there be one God or many by natural theology; nor whether the attributes of goodness, truth, or justice exist in such God or Gods. Hence when these men are shown that *their* God or Gods of Nature manifest evil of the worst kind and give them no clear knowledge of any better state hereafter, no wonder they talk about going into Atheism! that is their true position.

We are truly sorry for our friend Barker's position. We cannot imagine what outrage some *professed* Christians have inflicted upon him which has so embittered him against Christianity. We

respect him even in his apostacy from Christianity, but we have no sympathy for his "*silly cavils*" on the Scriptures. His "*cavils*" on our Lord's sermon on the mount, in the late Convention, we should suppose would have satisfied any sane mind that his delight is to find fault with Jesus. O, that he may yet return to him who alone can give him rest.

We are glad we attended that Convention. We loved the Bible before, but our love and attachment to it has been increased a hundred fold. Never did it appear so precious to us as now. Never did we see the weakness of Deism as now: yet the time has come that men having departed from the faith will give heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons, speaking lies in hypocrisy, and having their consciences seared as with a hot iron; and are given up to believe a lie that they may be condemned to death, because they have rejected the truth. We desire, however, to save as many from such a doom as possible; therefore we are glad that God enabled us to withstand publicly this flood of deism and atheism that is now flowing like a deluge over the earth to prepare men for the terrible harvest which is just at hand.

With whatever ability Br. Turner and ourself were enabled to manage our defence of the Bible, to the God of that blessed book be all the glory and praise. It is indeed a comfort to know that the effort to defend the truth of God and his Bible was not in vain. We are satisfied that whatever may be the boasts of those who were against the Bible, they were sadly disappointed in their effort at Hartford. Not one of their "Resolutions" were passed, nor did they care to hazard a vote on them. We would have been glad to have had one. There is no doubt they would have been voted down by an overwhelming majority.

P. S.—Since the foregoing was written an article appeared in the New York Tribune, of June 14, from Joseph Barker, on reading which we addressed the following note to Horace Greeley, editor of that paper:—

DISCUSSION ON THE BIBLE—THE OTHER SIDE.

To the Editor of the N. Y. Tribune:

NEW YORK, Tuesday, June 14, 1853.

SIR: I see in your paper of to-day, "Joseph Barker," Chairman of the late Hartford Convention says, that "Convention *exceeded* the expectations of its authors, except in one particular, namely, the weakness of the opposition they met with. They certainly expected to hear from believers in the divine authority of the Bible an abler defense of their views."

Santa Anna was sure he had "whipped General Taylor, only the old man did not know it!" Just about as appropriate is this boasting of Joseph

marker. If they ever dare to publish that discussion in full, the public can judge. In the meantime, will you do the justice to publish the following remarks from *The Hartford Courant*, the morning after the Convention closed:

"We must do justice to Messrs Storrs, of New York, and Turner, of this place, who manfully battled for the truth and authority of the Bible. Their arguments were unanswered and unanswerable."

If it is not asking too much, will you also give the following extract from *The Hartford Daily Times* of Thursday last. Speaking of one of the defenders of the Bible in that Convention, the editor says:

"Upon this somewhat novel arena, it is but justice to say that he acquitted himself with an ability which could scarcely have been equalled—certainly not surpassed—by any clerical man in the State. The ordinary clergy of the city no doubt felt it to be both a laborious and unpleasant duty to defend the Bible in a crowded and mixed assemblage. * * * Mr. S. chose to face the repulsive task which his brethren shrank from, and it is due to him to say, that he performed it in a manner which would have raised the highest reputation among them higher."

I ask the insertion as an act of justice, after Mr. Barker's self commendation of himself and associates; whom many believe were entirely routed in argument, at the aforesaid Convention.

ONE WHO WAS THERE."

To the foregoing note we appended the following:

"Private.—If you wish a responsible name, I subscribe myself

GEORGE STORRS, *Editor Bible Examiner*,
140 Fulton-st."

To our note the editor of the Tribune appended the following:—

"If the writer of the above had had the manliness to sign his 'self-commendation of himself' with his own name as Mr. Barker did, he would have been as deserving of respect. As it is, we are sorry to say that under the circumstance, his anonymous signature is rather mean and sneaking."

Our only object in the note to the Tribune was to show, that while Mr. Barker, a party in the discussion, had come to a conclusion favorable to himself and associates, and against the defenders of the Bible, the public in Hartford took another view of the subject. Had "self-commendation" been our object we would not have given an extract from the Hartford Times, suppressing the most commendatory part of the article and our name in full, more than once found in it.

Has our note to the Tribune unmasked its Editor, and shown that his sympathies are with the Deists and against the Bible? Let the commu-

nity know where the conductors of public journals stand. The Tribune in a previous article, from its correspondent, or reporter at the Convention, did Br. Turner great injustice, by its sneers at one of his speeches. We repeat it, Br. Turner did himself and the cause he defended honor, the sneers of the Tribune to the contrary notwithstanding. The sense of the community at Hartford on the subject of the defence of the Bible in that Convention may be seen in the following resolution, passed among others, at a large meeting of the citizens, held the evening after the Convention adjourned, at which Leonard B. Griffin, a Methodist minister, presided.

"Resolved, That the sincere and hearty thanks of Christendom are due to the Rev. Messrs. Storrs, of New York, and Turner of this city, for their able, manly, fearless, laborious and triumphant defence of the Holy Scriptures, during the recent Convention."

With such testimony in favor of our services at the Convention, we can bear to have the editor of the Tribune call us "*mean and sneaking*," and show his sympathy with the self-praising "Joseph Barker," Chairman, and principal deistical speaker at the Convention. Mr. Barker, we respect as a man, and for his defence of Christianity years ago; but we deeply deplore his fall, and most sincerely pity him in his present position.

—o—

AUTHENTICITY OF THE SCRIPTURES.—All the attempts of Deists to overthrow the Scriptures avail nothing unless they can impeach the integrity of the Witnesses. It is no argument against the Bible to say we do not know by whom, or when the books were written. It must be shown that whoever wrote them were impostors or knaves.

Impostors and knaves have always SELFISH ends in view. Deists say that the Scriptures are a forgery of designing Priests.

A careful examination of the Mosaic institutions will show that such an imputation is false, so far as that institution is concerned.

The same may be said of the institutions of Christianity. On these points we earnestly recommend, to all, a careful reading of Dr. McCulloh's work, noticed in the last Examiner. It sweeps away the whole refuge of Deistical lies, that the Scripture institutions and teachings by Moses and Jesus Christ are a forgery, and shows conclusively that they were divine in their origin.

—o—

"PLENARY."—This word is often used in speaking of the inspiration of the Bible; and many persons seem not to understand it. It means—full; entire; complete. In the mouths of objectors to the Bible, it seems to be used to make people believe that the defenders of the Bible hold that every word found in that book was given by immediate inspiration of God. We cannot say but there are those who do hold that view; but we

doubt if any intelligent Christian in this age maintains any such position.

The great question between us and the rejectors of the Bible is,—*Are the doctrines and institutions by Moses and Jesus Christ, of DIVINE appointment, and given by direct inspiration?*

It is not, even, whether *every word* used in the record of those institutions and doctrines was immediately inspired. On this point we can safely admit they were not; but we contend that a true record of the *mind of God* is made, though each writer might do it in his own words. The truthfulness of any transaction or event does not depend upon the uniformity of the words used by different witnesses, but in their agreement in the *facts* relating to the point in hand. Such agreement exists on the inspiration, or divine appointment of the doctrines and institutions by Moses and Jesus Christ; and all the "*silly caril*" of Deists only serves to make this truth more apparent to honest inquirers after truth.

—o—

SPIRIT RAPPING.—We cut the following from a Spirit Rapping paper in this city:

"**ROBERT OWEN AND SPIRITUALISM.**—Robert Owen is universally known as the author, and, for many years, the zealous propagator of a theory of Social Reform. Whatever of unphilosophical extravagance may have been incorporated with his views, it must be acknowledged that the productions of his pen have, in general, manifested a degree of practical common sense, and a power of observation and deduction, not likely to be imposed upon by any shallow system of fraud or delusive trickery. Until lately, Mr. Owen was a confirmed disbeliever in the *immortality of the soul*; but, like hundreds of others of the skeptical class, he has experienced an entire revolution in his views, in consequence of witnessing unmistakable manifestations of power and intelligence from the Spirits of the departed."

Spirit-Rappers seem to suppose, if they can convert a man to a belief of the natural "*immortality of the soul*," they have demonstrated the utility and truthfulness of their theory; but we come to precisely the opposite conclusion. The doctrine of the natural or inherent immortality of the soul we regard as *the greatest and most mischievous of lies!* There is not one solitary text in the Bible to support such a doctrine, except Gen. 3: 4, "Ye shall not surely die." Not another can be found. He who caused those words to be uttered, Jesus saith, is a "*liar*, and the *father of lies*." The conversion of Robert Owen, therefore, is only a fulfillment of Scripture, that "*Seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived.*" 2 Tim. 3: 13. We have so often heard the advocates of these Spirit rappings boast that men have

been converted by their means from infidelity, that we cannot forbear to say, that, in our opinion, they only go *a step deeper* in infidelity; yea, that they sink into a *hopeless state of it*. They seem to us to be given over, because of their disbelief of Bible truth, "to believe a lie," that they may be condemned to death, "the wages of sin." So far as our experience has been concerned, we have uniformly found such converts as Robert Owen greater despisers of the Bible than before, and exceedingly offended when we have used that book against them, manifesting the deepest hatred to it.

When we find a person who is a believer in the Bible converted to Spirit Rapping, we know that, unless he is soon arrested, he will in a short time renounce the Bible. We have seen this in many cases; and it was fully manifested at the late Convention at Hartford, Connecticut, some account of which we give this month. That Spirit Rappings and the Bible have any harmony between them is not true; they are as opposite to each other as *lying and truth*.

—o—

BIBLE VS. TRADITION.—This work has now been several weeks before the public; many have read it, and, with one solitary exception, so far as we know, it has met with universal commendation, and is regarded as the *very best work* that has appeared on the immortality question. Br. Marsh, of the Advent Harbinger, pronounces it a "*valuable work*," and expresses the desire "that the community in general may be induced to read it." Br. Turner, of the Second Advent Watchman, thus speaks of it:

"This is a new and deeply interesting work of 309 octavo pages, printed well on good paper, and neatly bound in cloth. It is all it professes to be; indeed, its value to the lover of the Bible can in no sense be appreciated except by knowing its contents and by studying the Bible by the light it reflects upon what are, to many minds, perplexing questions of theology. It will assist all who read it, to arrive at a correct knowledge of the penalty of the law of God—the state of the dead, and the true hope and source of immortality. Every family should possess this book, no other help can supply its place."

Many private individuals have spoken to us, or written to us, expressing similar sentiments. Br. Richmond, who is on a mission in the State of Indiana, under the Provisionary Committee, says of it, "It is a flood of light. I know not how I could dispense with it." See his letter.

Those who cannot preach, can buy at least one copy, and *lend* it through their neighborhood. It will preach most effectually.

Price 75 cents: for *one dollar*, sent us free of

postage, we will send one copy of it, and the two double Examiners, containing Ham's works, and repay the postage on them all. We make this liberal offer now, that each of those works may be speedily and more widely circulated.

For \$5 we will send ten copies of Bible vs. Tradition, but it must be at the expense of the purchaser.

—o—
SPIRIT: or the Hebrew Terms 'Ruach' and 'Neshamah,' and the Greek Term 'Pneuma.' By Wm. Glen Moncrieff." Edinburgh, Scotland.

We have received a copy of this work from the author, for which he will accept our thanks. It contains about 100 pages, 12mo., and is a valuable work on the subject of which it treats. The ground occupied is the same as that in Bible vs. Tradition. We may notice it more fully hereafter. The "Appendix" contains several valuable articles on "Materialism," which we shall give in the Examiner; we have made a commencement in this number. This work entire, or his work on "Soul," which we have previously noticed, we cannot reprint at present. We hope they may be widely circulated in England and Scotland, having no doubt they will do much good.

—o—
J. PANTON HAM.—The Christian Examiner is received regularly, and much prized; but the Hymn Book has never come to hand. We regret this much, as we have intended to enlarge, and improve our "Christian Psalmody," and hoped to find aid from yours.

—o—
"EVANGELICAL SOCIETY."—This Society was "Organized at Rochester, N. Y., June 4th, 1853," and has issued, in a pamphlet of ten pages, its "Address, Preamble, Constitution, and Bye-Laws." It has divided up the Northern, a small portion of the Southern States, and Canada, into twelve "Branches of this Society;" and contemplates going into the work of evangelizing all in its power to the whole truth of the Bible. It disclaims being a "Church Organization," and prohibits any "attempt to construct a Church creed." Any person may become a member by paying one dollar per year, and signing the Constitution and Bye-Laws.

We hold to the utmost liberty of action, in the work of spreading what any may think is truth, as taught in the Bible. This Society has been called into existence, according to the "Address of the Committee," by "oft repeated and urgent calls, from almost every quarter—'come over and help us!'" We wish it success in helping to

supply those calls. Their work, professionally, embraces the promulgation of the whole truth; but there are not a few who think some things may be embraced in their term "whole," which they could not contribute to spread abroad. If we were called upon to act with them we would far rather they should specify what they consider the whole truth. But as there is no probability of a perfect harmony in that respect, our opinion is unaltered as to its being the better way to act in reference to some point or points of neglected truth, leaving those who preach on these points at entire liberty to preach according to their own convictions on other topics. When the "Provisionary Committee," in this city, announced their object, they stated, distinctly, it was "to scatter light on the Life theme;" but that it had "no desire to restrict the laborers on other topics." So far as they felt called to preach on other topics, it was on their personal responsibility. We have no fault to find with our brethren, who may think that our object is too limited; let them act according to their own convictions in the case. The Provisionary Committee will go on with their proposed plan as before, without feeling themselves at all interfered with by the "division of the land" into "twelve" sections, or tribes. By the new Society, a medium is open for those to contribute funds who might have felt that the object of the Provisionary Committee was too limited. Such will now have no excuse for withholding funds. Others, doubtless, will prefer to contribute to the one object we have in view, to scatter light on the long-neglected and forgotten truth, that "Life and Immortality are through Jesus Christ alone!" Let all act as their judgment and preference shall prompt them.

NEW-YORK, June 20th, 1853.

HENRY A. CHITTENDEN,
HENRY F. JOHNSON, } Provisionary
GEO. STORRS, } Committee.

P. S. For the foregoing considerations, I must decline acting as one of the "Vice-Presidents" of the "Evangelical Society," as per appointment.

H. A. CHITTENDEN.

—o—
THE PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE acknowledge the receipt of the following sums into the treasury, since the issue of the June Examiner, viz.:

From Friends in Peru, Indiana, by C. M.

Richmond	-	\$ 30.00
" a Friend in Newton Hamilton, Pa.		5.00
" " " Williamsburg, N.Y.		1.00
" " " Worcester, Mass.		10.00

THE PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE have the pleasure of laying before the readers of the Examiner the following interesting letter from Br. C. M. RICHMOND, laboring in the State of Indiana.

PERU, INDIANA, June 6th, 1853.

Dear Brother Storrs :—I arrived in Peru, May 7th, from which date I shall regard myself as laboring under the sanction and direction of the Provisionary Committee. I have preached eleven times in the following villages :—Peru, Mexico, Chili, and Wabash Town. Congregations generally large and attentive. In this town are a few good brethren, who have been excluded or suspended from the several churches for presuming to interpret God's word according to their own judgments, and contrary to the traditions and creeds of men. One of these, Br. Bosworth, is now in great affliction. He has had two shocks of the palsy. I found him rejoicing in hope. Said I, "Br. B. do you look forward to the resurrection with hope and joy?" "That is everything," said he, his countenance beaming with delight, and with a faltering tongue, but an unflinching hope he repeated the following :—

"My flesh shall rest beneath the ground
Till the last trumpet's voice shall sound,
Then burst my chains with glad surprise,
And meet my Saviour in the skies."

In Chili, on Eel River, the interest seems very encouraging. The School House being too small to hold the people, we met in a grove near by. At night a Reformer, *alias* Campbellite, volunteered his services in behalf of endless torment, &c., which served to increase the excitement and deepen the inquiry—"are these things so?" On Monday evening I replied to our "orthodox" friend to more than could be accommodated in the School House—they stood at the windows and door. The truth, I think, is taking root in many hearts in Chili. I am to be there again, to follow up the effort next Lord's day. The ministers and leading men of the several churches seem to hear (if at all) with the least candor. In some instances they refuse to accept of any thing to read upon the subject, though they acknowledge they have never investigated the matter! If this is not "*loving darkness rather than light*," what is? I have many requests from various places to come and hold meetings, but I cannot comply with half of them. "The harvest is great and the laborers few." I intend, as soon as I get time, to go down the River and visit Logansport, and perhaps other places on the line of the Canal.

I have sold some publications and given away some, a report of which will in due time, be forth-

coming. The people must have time to think, and think again, and again, before they will give up their long cherished religious errors; and until the truth takes root and men become fully convinced of the truth of *Life only in Christ*, we can hardly expect much active effort. But I trust the time is not far distant, when this section of Indiana will be able to support a missionary, without any aid from abroad. But it is not so at present.

In this place the following sums have been subscribed to the fund of Provisionary Committee.

H. H. H.	\$20.00
A. R. A.	5.00
D. C. S.	5.00

I am told of two brethren, who are preaching the Life and Death doctrine in Indiana, with whom I am not yet acquainted. Br. David Wright of Independence, and Br. Moses Swallow, of Deerfield, Randolph County. I have written them, and expect to hear from them soon.

I received the commission of Provisionary Committee in good time, as well as the books sent by Br. Hall, all in good order. Br. Hall very generously gave in the freight, so that they came to me free of charge. We received the two copies of "Bible vs. Tradition," with great pleasure. I am thankful to you for your consideration in sending it. It is a flood of light. I know not how I could dispense with it. It seems to me it must turn orthodoxy from its base. Had I a few copies of it I think I could sell them readily.

I am encouraged in my work, for though I am despised and rejected by those who stand as the exponents of *immortality independent of Christ*, yet I find many warm Christian friends who bid me a hearty God speed; and I am encouraged by the parable of the sower, that *some seed* will fall into good ground, spring up, and yield thirty, sixty, and an hundred fold. Your brother,

C. M. RICHMOND.

NOTE BY EDITOR.—We rejoice that Br. Richmond is so much encouraged in his work, and that the prospect for doing good in Central Indiana opens so well. May the Lord abundantly sustain him. Our friends in the East should remember him pecuniarily, as his field is a new one with the exception of Peru, where a good beginning is made to furnish the funds necessary to carry on the work. It is a small compensation the Provisionary Committee have pledged to Br. Richmond; but to raise that we must continue to appeal to the friends of the truth he is laboring to disseminate. He ought to have a larger supply of books, tracts, &c., for gratuitous circulation. Who will help in this matter? *Who?*

THE PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE will make at least quarterly reports of all their *Expenditures*, as well as regular monthly notices of Receipts. No member of this Committee receives a cent from its funds for any purpose whatever. If any wish to help "Br. Storrs," they will communicate with him *individually*; as all money sent to the Provisional Committee will be appropriated to those who have been or may be announced as laborers in the field, by appointment of the Committee. BRS. WHITE and BLAIN have neither of them yet entered upon their agency. We hope they will be able to do so soon, and that others will be found to do the same. The great *Life Theme* must be published far and wide. The cry still comes up to us for help on this particular subject. Kindred subjects are important in their connection, but this theme lies at the foundation of the whole Gospel fabric; understand this, and all other subjects come in naturally, and complete the doctrinal, experimental, and practical temple of truth.

—o—
FROM A. N. SEYMOUR, MICHIGAN.

Br. Storrs.—The cause of truth in these Western States, I am well satisfied, is destined to move onward in spite of all opposition. The way opens before me, to go and preach the doctrine of "*No Immortality out of Christ.*" One good sign of success is, multitudes throng to hear, and I love to preach these precious truths better than I love to eat; and if I ever saw the time that I wanted to do a thousand days' work in one it is now; while I see the extreme foolishness of popular preaching, and its direct tendency to infidelity, I can hardly rest day nor night, and my prayer is,—Lord, send forth more true laborers into the great vineyard, for it is now *smutted* up by *Sectarianism*, and the monstrous dogma of *Immortal-soulism*; from which, good Lord, deliver the human family.

Yours in the love of the Gospel.

—o—
FROM W. H. JACOBS.

WILLIAMSBURG, N. Y., May 26th, 1853.

Br. Storrs.—"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good," is an injunction of Holy Writ, which receives but very little attention from professing Christians in these days of religious declension and conformity to the world. The traditions of men are adhered to rather than the doctrines of Jesus Christ and his Apostles. The word of God is consequently made of none effect. The commandments of men, instead of the word and testimony, predominate; iniquity abounds, and the love of many waxes cold.

Being unknown to many of your readers, permit me to make a brief statement with reference to myself. I have been a professor of Christianity about eleven years; was trained up a Baptist. My sympathies have always been with that sect. I have, during the past year, served the First Baptist Church in this place (of which I have been a member the last nine years,) in the office of Deacon.

By a diligent investigation of God's word, I have been led to reject the doctrine of Eternal Life in misery of the finally impenitent; and to believe that the soul that sinneth it shall die. My eyes have been opened—my mind has been enlightened, and the truth, as it is in Jesus, has made me free.

On the evening of April 19th inst., I was excluded from the Church, on the following charge, *viz.* :—*Denying the Personality of the Holy Spirit,—the Interminable Misery of the Wicked,—and the Immortality of the Soul.*

My humble efforts to lead others to embrace the truth have been blessed, and several are rejoicing with me in hope of the kingdom at the coming of Jesus Christ, which we trust is near at hand. May God, even our Father, bless you, my brother, and enlarge your usefulness; and cause many through your efforts to seek for immortality.

Yours, in hope of Eternal Life, which God, who cannot lie, promised before the world began.

—o—
BOLD ASSUMPTION.—At a Convention held at Rochester, N. Y., last month, the Harbinger reports Dr. John Thomas, as having said :—

"A man may believe the truth with all his heart for twenty years, and yet not be justified—Baptism is essential to this—this is the law of justification; we are immersed into the name of Jesus Christ."

We have italicised that part of the remarks which we denominate a *bold assumption*. The Bible teaches, in no equivocal terms, that "the law of justification" is *faith*. "That he [God] might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay: but by the law of faith." Rom. 3: 26, 27. "Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith," v. 30. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. 5: 1. But it is needless to multiply texts of Scripture on this point; nothing is taught more distinctly than that "the law of justification" is "*faith*." To affirm that "bap-

tism is the law of justification," and that "a man may believe *the truth with all his heart* for twenty years," or one year, or one hour, "and yet not be justified," we regard as unscriptural and a daring assumption. The question is *not* whether he can *continue* justified unless he is afterwards baptized; that may be true; and it is equally true that he cannot continue justified if he *knowingly* disobeys God in any of his commands: but that "baptism is *essential*," [i.e. that without which it is impossible] to "be justified," is neither scriptural or rational; and such an assumption we regard as the very *highest* development of *sectarianism*. We express our opinion of the sentiment distinctly, that none need be in doubt as to our position on that question. If men wish to establish a *bitter and persecuting sect*, the sentiment we have animadverted upon is the very best they can start with. We are determined to have no strife with those who hold and promulgate such sentiments; we have borne our testimony against it, and thus discharged what we believed was a duty.

JOSEPH BARKER, the Chairman of the late Convention at Hartford, was in 1841 an able defender of the Bible and Christianity in England. We admired his work entitled "*Christianity Triumphant*," which we purchased some years ago. We have only space this month for two short extracts from it, they are as follows:

"I never saw any harm of any kind that ever Christianity produced. I have now for a long time had something to do with Christianity myself, and it has done *me* no harm. I have studied it attentively for many years: I have believed its doctrines; and I have endeavored, in some measure, to obey its precepts; and it has neither made me vicious nor miserable; it has not injured me either in body or in soul. It has done just the contrary. I was once as violent and revengeful as a youth could easily be; a provocation would have thrown me into a fury, and an injury would have been almost sure to be followed with revenge. But that is not the case with me now; the religion of Christ has produced a happy change.

"Nor has Christianity produced any mischievous effects upon any of my kindred or acquaintances. My parents have been believers in the religion of Christ, and have lived under the influence of its principles for more than forty years; but it never made *them* either vicious or miserable. They have been faithful and affectionate to each other; *they have been kind and attentive to their children*; they have been temperate and industrious; they have been true and upright; and according to their ability, they have labored to promote the welfare of their fellow-creatures. My brothers and sisters are most of them religious; they read and study the religion of Christ on purpose that they may obey its teachings; and yet they are not remarkable either for vice or misery. I have relations that are *not* Christians: I have relations that

profess not to believe the Gospel, and who live in open violation of its laws; and *they* are both vicious and miserable. As far as my acquaintance with the world goes, things are just the opposite of what our opponents represent them to be. Those who most heartily believe, and most faithfully practice the religion of Christ, I have always found to be the most virtuous and happy; and those who know the least or care the least for the religion of Christ, I have generally found to be the most vicious and miserable. If men are vicious and miserable, it is for *want* of Christianity; and it seems almost a mystery how any man of common understanding can believe it to be otherwise."

"I have no anxiety as to the fate of the religion of Christ: it will triumph for ever, and every conflict through which it may have to pass, will only add to it new strength and glory. My only anxiety is for you for whom I write. And if you will ponder well the evidence which has been laid before you; if you will silence the uproar of clamorous and rebellious passions; if you will pay respect to the voice of reason, of conscience, and of truth, my soul will be at rest. You will not only perceive the charges which have been brought against Christianity to be unfounded, but you will acknowledge it, and feel it in your souls to be worthy of unbounded and eternal love. For myself, I declare to you, that while I contemplate its spotless and glorious character, and survey the vast and countless blessings which it has bestowed on the children of men, my heart is full, and the unutterable emotions of my soul break forth in tears. It is the image of the eternal God, and the friend and benefactor of mankind. It blesses all ranks,—it blesses them in all ways,—and it makes them abundant in communicating blessings to their fellow men. It makes those who are rich tender-hearted and liberal,—it makes those who are high, condescending and gentle,—it improves the condition of the poor on earth, and it gives them a title to a kingdom in the world to come. It regenerates men's souls, it reforms their lives,—and it improves their lot. It makes them good; it makes them useful; and it makes them happy. It has blessings for every country, for every family, and for every heart. It wages war with all institutions that are founded in error and injustice. It is opposed to every thing that is opposed to the interests of mankind; and it is friendly to every thing that is friendly to man's welfare. It is the illuminator, the emancipator, the regenerator of the universe. Its foundation is eternal truth; its effects are the joys of Heaven itself; and it stands alone, the fairest visitant of earth,—the loveliest offspring of the skies,—the bright effulgence of eternal light,—the best, the mightiest, the universal, and the eternal friend of man."

The foregoing beautiful extract, uttered by our friend Barker, when he was a Christian, shows how happy he was then. He has changed his position now, but is he as happy now as then? If he is, we entirely failed to discover it at the late Convention.

DANVILLE, N. Y.—We have been desired to visit there in October. If the Lord will, we will spend the 2d and 3d Sabbaths of that month there.